
This is the **published version** of the article:

Montgé Ginés, Laia; Escobar Urmeneta, Cristina. The role of interaction in the development of the students' writing skills. A study using model texts as feedback. 2019. 69 p.

This version is available at <https://ddd.uab.cat/record/211093>

under the terms of the  license

The role of interaction in the development of the students' writing skills

A study using model texts as feedback

Laia Montgé Ginés

Master's Dissertation

June 2019

Tutora: Cristina Escobar Urmeneta



Màster de Formació del Professorat d'Educació Secundària Obligatòria i
Batxillerat, Formació Professional i Ensenyament d'Idiomes
Especialitat d'anglès

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Cristina Escobar, my tutor, for guiding me and the advice given throughout the project. I would also like to acknowledge Estefanía Santidrián and Cristina Ceide, my school mentors, for letting me train as a teacher in their classrooms and for their help during the lessons. Moreover, special thanks to the students who kindly participated in the study for the hard work they did. Last but not least, thanks to the classmates who collaborated in the project for sharing ideas and their help and advice.

Table of contents

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Research question.....	2
1.2 Context	3
2. Literature review.....	4
3. Methodology.....	7
3.1 Teaching sequence.....	8
3.2 Context and participants	10
3.3 Data collection and selection.....	11
3.4 Data treatment	12
3.5 Resulting corpus	12
3.6 Data analysis.....	13
4. Results.....	13
4.1 Differences between the initial and final texts	13
4.1.1 Pair 1	13
4.1.2 Pair 2	15
4.2 Sharing activity.....	16
4.3 Peer revision	20
4.3.1 Pair 1	21
4.3.2 Pair 2	24
5. Discussion.....	26
6. Conclusion	32
7. References.....	36

8. Appendixes.....	38
Appendix.1 Model texts.....	38
Appendix 2. Texts from the students (Valeria).....	39
Appendix 3. Texts from the students (Laura)	41
Appendix 4. Texts from the students (Halima).....	43
Appendix 5. Texts from the students (Juan)	45
Appendix 6. Symbols of transcription	46
Appendix 7. Transcription of the sharing activity	47
Appendix 8. Transcription of the peer revision (pair 1)	53
Appendix 9. Transcription of the peer revision (pair 2)	57

Abstract

Using model texts as a corrective feedback technique is believed to provide students with meaningful feedback, which could lead to the improvement of their writing skills. The aim of this study is to determine whether interaction among peers and with the teacher generated by the use of model texts as feedback has a positive effect on the development of the students' writing skills. To do so, the focus has been put on the differences between the students' initial and final texts. A qualitative and interpretative analysis has been conducted to see whether these differences could be attributed to the discussion during the interactional phase. The results confirm the expectations, although further research is advisable to gain a better understanding of this type of feedback.

Key words: noticing theory, model texts as corrective feedback, guided discovery, classroom interactional competence, peer revision, interaction.

Resum

L'ús de textos model com a tècnica de feedback correctiu pot proporcionar als estudiants un feedback rellevant, que podria conduir a la millora de la seva expressió escrita. L'objectiu d'aquest estudi és determinar si la interacció amb els companys i amb el professor durant l'ús de textos models com a feedback té un efecte positiu en el desenvolupament de l'expressió escrita dels alumnes. Per tal de dur-lo a terme, s'ha posat el focus en les diferències entre els primers textos dels estudiants i les seves històries finals. S'ha realitzat un anàlisi qualitatiu i interpretatiu per veure si aquestes diferències es podrien atribuir a la discussió durant la fase de la interacció. Els resultats confirmen les expectatives, tot i que és aconsellable seguir fent recerca sobre aquest tema, per tal d'aconseguir una millor comprensió sobre aquest tipus de feedback.

Paraules clau: teoria del descobriment, el text model com a feedback correctiu, descobriment guiat, competència de la interacció a classe, revisió entre companys, interacció.

1. Introduction

Writing is believed to be a relevant skill to develop in second language acquisition and the writing-to-learn perspective “has seen it as a vehicle for learning” (Williams, 2012, p.321). Moreover, the current Catalan curriculum includes several competences which refer to this skill, such as competence 8 (producing written texts of different typologies and formats applying textualization strategies) or competence 9 (revising texts in order to improve them according to the communicative purpose with the help of supports). Regarding the later, traditionally, a model would be given to students prior to the writing process and students would receive feedback from the teacher in the form of annotations on their compositions. Hence, students would not participate in the text revision process. This approach is believed to present limitations to the improvement of the writing skills. Instead, a more active attitude of students towards the correction process is thought to be desirable in order for them to learn from their output. According to the noticing theory developed by Schmidt (1990), students need to consciously notice a language aspect to learn it.

Hence, with the pedagogical purpose of giving meaningful feedback that could have a positive impact on the students’ future performance in writing, the strategy of using model texts as a corrective feedback technique will be implemented in this study. This approach states that models should be given to pupils after they have written a text. This way, students are believed to notice gaps in their knowledge when comparing their written productions with the model text. During this comparison, interaction is used between students and between students and the teacher to help the noticing process. In this case, the implementation results of this activity will be evaluated to see whether the interaction and the feedback received from peers and the teacher help students notice their gaps and improve their writing skills.

This study in particular has two main objectives, the first of which being the development and improvement of one's teaching practice. It is believed that teacher-led research is a powerful tool for teachers to revise what is being done in class and learn from it. This way, teachers can learn from what they do, implement and test new approaches and develop their knowledge and skills.

The second goal of the research is to explore the impact of feedback on the development of students' writing skills, when using models as feedback. In other words, the objective of this study is to see whether the feedback in the form of interaction, between peers and with the teacher, could lead to the improvement of the writing skills. This objective will be developed in the following section with the establishment of the research question.

Also, it has to be said that this project is part of a broader study conducted by a group of teachers-as-researchers, including Aceña, Acho, Astiazaran, Capdevila, Plaza, Reche and Suau, supervised by Escobar Urmeneta. They have also studied the teaching technique of giving models as feedback, but using different perspectives.

1.1 Research question

With the objective of shedding light on the issue of giving model texts as corrective feedback, the aim of this study is to determine the impact of this approach on the development of the students' writing skills, as it was already mentioned above. To do so, the focus will be put on the differences between the students' initial texts (T1) and final stories (T2). Afterwards, an analysis of the interactional phase, with peers and the teacher, will be conducted in order to see whether the differences found between T1 and T2 could be traced back to the class conversations. This way, it is believed that data will determine the importance, or not, of this kind of feedback in the improvement of students' writing skills.

Hence, the questions this study seeks to answer are the following:

- **RQ 1** What differences (in terms of structure, punctuation, grammar and lexicon) can be observed between the students' initial and final texts?

- **RQ 1.1** What influence might class conversations have had in the differences observed?

1.2 Context

The school where the study took place is situated on the outskirts of a medium-size city located in the metropolitan area of Barcelona. The neighbourhood grew during the twentieth century due to different immigration waves. Nowadays, 26% of its population comes from other parts of Spain and 12% is of foreign origin. Economically speaking, it is an industrial district and its 15,978 inhabitants could be described as middle and working class, with a current unemployment rate of 11.5%.

Regarding the secondary school, it is a public-funded school and relatively small, with 447 students whose mother tongue is mainly Spanish. With regards to the grouping, there are four groups in each of the lower secondary education levels (ESO) and two in the higher secondary education (Batxillerat). Furthermore, the class size is relatively small, with between twenty and twenty-five students per group. The school's teaching approach is based on the use of coursebooks and independent subjects. It needs be said that English is very present in its educational structure, since maths is taught in English in Grades 7 and 8 (1st and 2nd of ESO, respectively) and a project to create a TV programme in English is being implemented in the Grade 7 ICT class.

As far as the English lessons are concerned, a coursebook is used and little interaction among students is encouraged. It could be said that the class is mainly teacher-led.

A relevant aspect to comment on is the fact that technology is present in the English lessons, through exercises on the digital board and the once-a-week lesson in the computer room, where the teacher takes advantage of the opportunity to develop the students' digital competence.

With respect to the class that participated in the research, a Grade 10 group (4th of ESO) was chosen. The class consisted of twenty-two students with an English level that ranged from A2 to B1, according to the teacher's assessment system.

2. Literature review

This study is an attempt to address the issue of corrective feedback in the form of model texts and the oral feedback given by both the teacher and the classmates. In this section, a literature review will be conducted in order to observe the researchers' findings on the topic of corrective feedback giving model texts; and how a teacher-class conversation and the peer interaction can contribute to the development of students' language skills and their writing abilities, in particular.

First of all, it should be mentioned that this study is embedded into the sociocultural perspective, developed by Vygotsky, which states that context and social interaction play an important role in the language learning process. According to this perspective, interaction is key to develop one's language skills (Moore, 2016) and learning is accomplished when students interact with other people (Martínez-Ciprés, 2016). Hence, there is a strong connection between learning and interaction.

A concept that is linked to this perspective and is relevant to be mentioned is the one of scaffolding (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976), which refers to the temporary support a teacher gives students to do a task which is beyond their skills, taking into consideration that the learning process takes place in a social context.

Another key concept that should be addressed here is the one of the Classroom Interactional Competence (Escobar Urmeneta & Walsh, 2017). This competence could be defined as “the teachers’ and learners’ ability to use interaction as a tool for mediating and assisting learning” (Walsh, 2011 cited by Escobar & Walsh, 2017, p.190). Despite being context dependent, CIC should always present the following characteristics: the interaction and the teaching goals have to be linked; a “space for learning” has to be created; and students need to feel comfortable and safe in this space for them to be able to speak freely. In their study in a CLIL lesson, they conclude that in the teacher-students interaction, the teacher needs to use different resources to make sure students understand and follow the conversation. Furthermore, it is argued that giving feedback is one of the most significant interactional practices for teachers in class and it can encourage learning, since students are guided to the right answers.

In the next lines, studies which have developed the topic of corrective feedback in the form of model texts are going to be explored to examine how this technique should be developed in class. Furthermore, their findings in their different research projects are believed to be relevant for the present study, as well.

In Coyle and Cánovas (2019), it is argued that writing contributes to the learning process of a foreign language and corrective feedback can help students see what they have done wrong, fact that could be linked to the noticing theory mentioned above (Schmidt, 1990). This written corrective feedback can be delivered in many different ways one of which being giving model texts. Once students have written a text, a model created by the teacher is distributed for students to compare it with their own and discover gaps in their knowledge, things they have done wrong and also, alternative ideas from the model that could be included in their texts in order to improve them in the rewriting process.

In their study, Coyle and Cánovas (2019) focus on the teacher's role in guiding the discussion and in the comparison of language features in the model text and the ones written by students (guided discovery). They conclude that by raising children's awareness of different categories, such as content, vocabulary, spelling or structure, students can improve their writing skills.

Not only the role of the teacher is examined in the literature but also the learners' noticing process and the effects this noticing has on their final written texts (Roca de Larios & Martínez, 2010). Their study analyses the potential positive effects of feedback from model texts. It follows the idea that when students produce output, they encounter gaps between what they know and what they want to write and consequently, giving them models as corrective feedback can make them see what they need and add it in their final output. Their findings show that during the writing process, students mainly encountered lexical problems and when comparing their texts to the models, they discovered some interesting expressions and ideas. However, only a few of these solutions were incorporated into the revised text. Another aspect to take into consideration from the study is that the students who worked individually in the research noticed and incorporated less features than those who worked in pairs. Hence, it could be argued that collaboration could have positive effects on noticing language features in the models.

García Mayo & Labandibar (2017) have also investigated the use of model texts as corrective feedback in writing activities. Their study is embedded in the belief of the writing-to-learn potential. It is believed that noticing when writing can lead to modified output. This noticing needs to be understood by students to have a higher impact in their learning so "higher quality noticing" is advised to be promoted and rehearsed in order to then incorporate the things that have been noticed in the students' long-term memory.

In their study, García Mayo and Labandibar (2017) investigate what aspects of language students notice and incorporate, similarly to Roca de Larios and Martínez (2010). Their findings show that students were able to notice things, especially lexicon, autonomously and incorporated some in the rewriting stage. Hence, it is claimed that output can play a role in noticing language features. Moreover, they could see that learners with a lower proficiency level needed more guidance in the noticing process. Finally, another thing to consider regarding activity planning would be that it is essential to adapt the level of the model to the students' level, for them to understand what they read and find interesting features that could be included in their own texts during the rewriting stage.

In brief, it might be argued that using model texts as corrective feedback is a strategy that could have a positive impact on the development of students' writing skills. It is thought that this kind of feedback could help students notice what they have done wrong, learn from their output and improve their written texts.

After having read about the topic, it is believed that several things should be considered when implementing this strategy in class. Firstly, a good model text that matches the students' level is essential for learners to be able to notice differences and learn new structures. Moreover, the role of the teacher is important in guiding students throughout the noticing process. Finally, it could be said that collaboration among students could have a positive effect in realising things from their texts.

3. Methodology

The methodological approach which was employed in this research was qualitative and interpretative. In addition, the study was based on an ecological classroom research, since the data collection was produced in a social environment and the variables were not controlled (Moore, 2016).

Moreover, this study could be classified as action-based research, although only the first phases of the sequence were conducted, because a teaching strategy (giving model texts as feedback) was implemented in class. Afterwards, information was gathered to observe what happened and to analyse and evaluate the results of such activity (Nussbaum, 2017).

More specifically, the methodology used in the present study partly follows the one conducted by Martínez-Ciprés (2006), which was implemented in a pedagogy class at university. Students had to write a text to then co-assess it with a peer with the help of an assessment guideline and finally, write another text individually. The researcher compared the first and final texts and examined the classmates' conversation during the co-assessment process, to see whether the interaction and the assessment guideline had an impact on the students' written output, putting the focus on text cohesion. Her findings state that including cohesion in the assessment guideline encourages students to discuss this aspect and make changes in their final texts. In the present study, a comparison between the initial and final texts of some students was also done and the conversation between the students during the peer revision activity was analysed, as well, to see if the changes in the texts could be traced back to the conversations. However, there was not an assessment guideline in this case, but a model text instead, as it will be explained in the following sections.

3.1 Teaching sequence

The aim of the teaching sequence was to produce a writing task. Specifically, a love story (narrative) was chosen as the type of text students had to write, which is one of the genres included in the Catalan linguistic curriculum. In terms of the curriculum competences that were developed in the lessons, this activity could be linked to competence 8 (producing written texts of different typologies and formats applying textualization strategies) and especially, competence 9 (revising texts in order to improve them according to the communicative purpose with the help of supports).

Regarding the lesson plan, it consisted of a two-lesson sequence, which was held on 27 February and 1 March 2019. First of all, the need for writing was created. Students were told that the activity was a means to prepare for the local literature contest that would take place the following month. Moreover, two activating activities were done. First, students were asked to brainstorm words that meant love for them and the teacher wrote them on the blackboard. Second, a film trailer of a love story (*Love, Simon*) was projected and students had to brainstorm what the story was about and what could happen next. The objective of this activity was to introduce students to the topic (love) and show them an example of what they could write about. After that, they were ready to start writing a love story individually, which was collected at the end of the class.

In the second lesson, their initial texts were returned to the students and they were told to rewrite the story with the objective of writing the best possible text to participate in the literature contest. Before doing so, two models of different complexity levels (see Appendix 1) were distributed and students were asked to work in pairs for 15 minutes. They had to look for differences between their stories and the models and check each other's texts to find things that needed improvement (*peer revision*). Students could write on their texts or take notes underneath with the things they would like to change or include. Afterwards, a talk between the whole class and the teacher was produced (*sharing activity*). The teacher conducted a short conversation of approximately 5 minutes, which could be called a guided discovery. Its objective was to highlight important features pupils had to pay attention to, such as the structure of the story or the use of the past tense in narrative texts. Students also shared what they had noticed during the peer revision task with the rest of the class. Then, pupils wrote their love stories again and could use their initial texts and the notes they had taken during the peer revision task and the sharing activity. Finally, students commented on their thoughts about the learning experience.

In brief, the teaching sequence followed the steps below:

First lesson

- **Lead in activity** (5 min): need for writing (literature contest).
- **Activation activity 1** (10 min): brainstorming love-related words, which were written on the blackboard.
- **Activation activity 2** (15 min): trailer watching (*Love, Simon*) and class debate about the story. Trailer retrieved from:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ykHeGtN4m94>
- Instructions for the **writing activity** (25 min): “Write a love story. Try to be as creative as possible. You may get inspiration from the trailer seen before or the brainstorming”.

Second lesson

- **Teacher explanation** (5 min): students were told that they had to rewrite their stories to improve them for the literature contest.
- **Peer revision** (15 min): students divided into pairs compared their texts with the models and revised what they had written.
- **Sharing activity** (5 min): teacher-students talk about the features they had found during the peer revision. The teacher also elicited more aspects that were considered important in a narrative text.
- **Rewriting activity** (25 min): students wrote their texts again
- **Closing activity** (10 min): class debate about their learning experience.

3.2 Context and participants

The data collection process for the present study took place in a high school on the outskirts of a medium city in the metropolitan area of Barcelona whose characteristics were previously described. Specifically, the activity was developed in Grade 10 (4th of ESO).

Regarding the participants in the study, although all the class did the activity and took part in the sharing activity, two pairs were selected to be recorded while doing the peer revision activity on the second day of the teaching sequence. Students were sitting in pairs according to their usual class distribution and the two pairs were selected because they volunteered to be recorded. With regards to the participants' characteristics, pair 1 consisted of two fifteen-year-old female students, while the second pair included a male and a female of the same age.

All students agreed to the recording of the activity and an authorisation to record for academic purposes was signed by the teachers and the school. To preserve students' anonymity, the names of the participants were invented, choosing names that could give details about their gender and cultural origin, being Valeria and Laura the participants in pair 1 and Juan and Halima, the members of pair 2. The name of the secondary school was not mentioned throughout the study, to serve the same privacy objective.

3.3 Data collection and selection

The data collection procedure was conducted in the second session of the teaching sequence, which was when the interactional phase was produced, and it was selected to fulfil the aim of the study. Data consisted of three recordings of three different discussions (two conversations during the peer revision between the two selected pairs, which lasted between three and four minutes each; and a teacher-students talk which was four minutes long, during the sharing activity). Moreover, students' productions, both their initial texts and final love stories which ranged from 74 to 175 words, were collected and analysed, as well as the notes they took regarding their texts during the peer revision task.

In terms of the recording conditions, a mobile phone camera was placed at the back of the class during the sharing activity with the teacher and two were used to record the two pairs who participated in the study.

3.4 Data treatment

The conversations of the three video recordings described above were transcribed, using the Jeffersonian Transcript Notation System (Appendix 6), in order to conduct the data analysis. The used tools to do so were Microsoft Word. Regarding the video recordings, they were uploaded to Google Drive and a shareable link was used to include them in the study. Lastly, the eight compositions of the four participants in the study (initial and final texts) were scanned to be studied, classifying them with a number 1 (initial text) or 2 (final story).

3.5 Resulting corpus

Regarding the resulting corpus of the study, these two tables show the numbers of the analysed texts and conversations, respectively.

	Text 1 (initial text)	Text 2 (final story)
Number of texts	4	4
Number of words	275 (pair 1) 209 (pair 2)	288 (pair 1) 214 (pair 2)

Figure 1: resulting corpus of the texts

	Conversation 1 (sharing activity)	Conversation 2 (pair 1)	Conversation 3 (pair 2)
Recorded time	4'10''	3'30''	4'31''
Number of words	635	210	235
Number of speakers	20	2	2

Figure 2: resulting corpus of the conversations

3.6 Data analysis

The data analysis was qualitative and interpretative with the objective of answering the research questions. First of all, the students' final texts and their initial ones were explored and compared to see the differences in order to answer RQ 1. Secondly, the cause of these differences was traced with the objective of answering RQ 1.1. An analysis of the recorded conversations was conducted, including peer and teacher-students interactions, to see whether those changes had their origin in the interactional phase.

4. Results

In this section, a description of the observed phenomena will be presented as well as an analysis of the data, following the data analysis criteria established above. First of all, the differences between the initial texts and final stories of the first and second pairs were identified and classified in terms of structure, punctuation, grammar and lexicon, which were the categories that students found in their texts. Secondly, the teacher-students talk (*sharing activity*) and the peer revision tasks were transcribed to determine whether the differences found in the texts were mentioned in these different conversations.

4.1 Differences between the initial and final texts

4.1.1 Pair 1

4 texts have been analysed in this comparison, Valeria and Laura's initial and final texts. In both cases, several changes have been identified (stories are in Appendixes 2 and 3) and all the features that were marked in the first text are present in the second. Regarding the editing method, in Laura's initial text the correction was done on top of it and a sentence was added under the love story, while in the second case, Valeria wrote asterisks in her story and then, wrote what she wanted to change below the text.

In both cases, changes in structure, punctuation, grammar and lexicon have been identified. Regarding the structure, Valeria and Laura changed their titles, from love story to something more connected to their stories. Moreover, Valeria included a new paragraph in the story. In her initial text, there were only two but in the final story, three could be observed since she divided the first one into two different paragraphs. Finally, Laura added a new connector, *and*, to her final story.

With reference to the punctuation, some changes were made regarding commas in both texts. In Valeria's text, she added commas in her first sentence (*Jorja Smith, a student from England, decided...*). Moreover, Laura added several commas in certain parts of her text. Specifically these additions could be found in the following sentences: *...she found a girl, and she was...; ...what happened, and her friend...; ... was very frightened, but finally...*

In terms of grammar, Laura's most changed item was the possessive adjective, from *his* to *her*, as the main character of the story was a girl and she had used the male form. Some verbs were also changed in her text, such as *walked* (past simple) that in the final story was transformed to *was walking* (past continuous). Furthermore, she corrected a subject duplication (*Betty she was frightened* was changed to *Betty was frightened*). Valeria also varied the structure of one sentence, she had written a sentence without the subject and the verb and in the final story, she included them (*she had brown eyes*). In addition, she made a change regarding the genitive (*Hoseok's parents* instead of *the parents of Hoseok*) and wrote a nationality term using capital letters (*Asian*).

Concerning the lexicon, Valeria changed *time passed* for *time went on* and there was a spelling variation (from *aprove* to *approve*). On the other hand, Laura wrote *told* instead of *said* and *started dating* rather than *were girlfriends*. Moreover, there was a sentence in her final story that was not present in her initial text: *once they fell in love, the first time they met*.

A summary of the language features that were changed in each of the students' texts is shown in the following grid.

	Structure	Punctuation	Grammar	Lexicon
Valeria's texts				
Laura's texts				

Figure 3: summary of changed features in the texts (pair 1)

4.1.2 Pair 2

4 other texts have been analysed in this comparison, Juan's first and final stories and Halima's ones, and the same procedure as in the previous analysis has been followed (complete texts can be observed in Appendixes 4 and 5). In both cases, some changes have been identified as well. It has to be said that in this case, both students edited their first texts during the peer revision on top of their composition and did not write anything below their texts.

In both cases, changes in structure, punctuation and grammar have been identified. In terms of the structure, the difference concerns the title of the story. Neither of them had written one in their initial texts but a title is present in their final love stories and it is connected to what happens in their narratives.

Regarding the punctuation, Halima added question marks after two questions (*what's your name? / and you?*) and a comma (*hello, what's your...*). Juan also made some changes by adding full stops to make the sentences shorter (*The last day of class. In a class... / ... and unsociable boy. In his same class...*) and removed a comma (*who liked to the girl...*).

Halima and Juan also made changes in terms of grammar. She added a subject before a verb (*he did not he dare*) and changed the word *as* from the initial text for *how* in the second, although these two changes are not grammatically correct. Juan, on the other hand, removed a duplication. In his initial story, he had written *with no with anyone*, while only the last two words are present in the final text. Finally, another change about lexicon can be identified in Juan's text. In his final text, he wrote *with* instead of *without*.

The different features which have been identified to have been edited in the texts of the second pair are summarised in the following grid.

	Structure	Punctuation	Grammar	Lexicon
Juan's texts				
Halima's texts				X

Figure 4: summary of changed features in the texts (pair 2)

After establishing the changes, it could be argued that several differences could be found between the students' texts, although quantitatively the first pair found more than the second one. These changes are of different nature, concerning various language aspects, including structure, punctuation, grammar and lexicon. In the following sections, the origin of these changes will be traced to see whether the conversations during the interactional phase encouraged the noticing of language aspects and consequently, the improvement of the students' writing skills.

4.2 Sharing activity

The sharing activity consists of a conversation between the teacher and the students, guided by the former, about some language aspects that the teacher or the pupils consider important to be highlighted.

Throughout the conversation, students share with their classmates what they have noticed when comparing their texts to the models. Moreover, the teacher has previously read the students' initial texts and detected difficulties they have encountered, mistakes they have made or things which have not been included in their texts and could be interesting or necessary to be present. This type of conversation is aimed at helping students notice gaps in their knowledge or understand the errors they have made in their output (Coyle & Cánovas, 2019) to be able to correct them. In the present study, the conversation revolved around grammatical and structural aspects, commenting on features such as the number of parts in a story, the need to have a title or the use of the past tense, among others.

Connecting the identified changes in the students' texts with the sharing activity, three aspects appeared in the conversation (transcription of the complete talk in Appendix 7). On the one hand, the need to have a title which was original and connected to the story was mentioned by the teacher, as in the initial texts, the teacher had seen that most of the students had written "A love story", like Valeria and Laura or no title at all, like Juan and Halima. In the conversation, the teacher made students realise that there were titles in both model texts and that they were related to the story, not just a description of the type of text it was. Moreover, a change of title was suggested in texts which were entitled "A love story", as it can be observed in this excerpt.

Excerpt 1. Talking about the title (1'35'' – 2'08'')

97	T1	and (1.6) have you seen ((pointing at her
98		left eye to exemplify see)) <u>the title</u> ↑ in
99		the <u>model</u> (.) text ↑
100	S10	ah no no yo no he puesto xxx
101		<i>I have not written</i>
102	T1	ok ↓ so do you think that a story needs a
103		title ↑ or not ↓
104	Ss	yes ↓
105	T1	yes ↓ and the title is <u>a love story</u> ↑ or it
106		can be a bit more (.) <u>original</u> ↓

107 ((gesticulating))
 108 S12 original ↓
 109 T1 more original ↑ yes ↑ for example yours
 110 ((pointing at a student)) >was original<
 111 ((smiling)) yes ↑ ok ↑
 112 T1 so (.) maybe you can change the title >as
 113 well ↑< yes ↑ >instead of saying< a love
 114 story (.) you can say (.) I don't know (2.1)
 115 something related to the story ↑ yes ↑
 116 ((gesticulating throughout the explanation))
 117 S13 yes ↓

On the other hand, Valeria had added a new paragraph in her story, dividing the first one into two shorter ones. This aspect was also discussed during the guided discovery. First of all, the teacher made students notice the number of paragraphs in the model texts. Secondly, she elicited the parts that a text needed and its names, as it is shown in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 2. Talking about the structure of a story (2'14'' – 3'22'')

122 T1 and (.) have you seen ((pointing at her eyes
 123 with two fingers to show the verb see)) the
 124 <structure of the model> as well ↑
 125 ((dividing an imaginary story into three
 126 parts with her hand)) do you see that (.)
 127 <there are (.) different parts ↑> (2.3)
 128 ((dividing a text in the air again))
 129 T1 yes ↑ (1.4) in the model there are different
 130 parts ↑ or not ↓
 131 S14 yes ↓
 132 T1 yes ↑ how many parts ↑
 133 S14 one (.) two (.) three ↓
 134 T1 three (.) ok ↓ so in your stories (.) do you
 135 have (.) [different parts ↑ ((dividing an
 136 imaginary story into different parts with
 137 her hands)) or everything is together ↓
 138 ((showing just one block with both hands))
 139 S1 [one (.) two (.) three (.) °one two three
 140 one two three° ((singing))
 141 S15 together ↓
 142 T1 [together ↑
 143 S16 [together ↓

144 S14 [**dos** parts
 145 *Two*
 146 T1 two parts ↑ ok ↓
 147 T1 do you think you have to divide the story
 148 into parts ↑ ((dividing an imaginary story
 149 into three parts)) or not ↓ (2.2) what do
 150 you think ↑
 151 S12 yes ↓
 152 T1 yes ↑ (.) ((pointing at a student)) maybe ↑
 153 why ↑
 154 S17 ((laughing)) °**ya te ha cogido**°
 155 *she has caught you*
 156 T1 <because ↑>
 157 S12 because (1.5) the first part are the
 158 ((stops to think)) (3.7)
 159 T1 introduction ↑
 160 S12 **sí** [introduction ↓
 161 *yes*
 162 T1 [yes ↑ ok ↑
 163 S12 and the second part is °the story xxx°
 164 T1 yes ↑ (.) ok ↑ very good ↓ we need an
 165 introduction ↑ no ↑ then we explain the story
 166 more or less ↑ (1.6) and then the conclusion ↓
 167 (.) the resolution ↓ (.) yes ↑ ((splitting
 168 an imaginary text in the air with her hands))
 169 so maybe you can divide your story (.) into
 170 paragraphs (.) into different parts (.) look
 171 at them ↓ (.) ok ↑ ((gesticulating))

Finally, apart from the structure, a grammar aspect that was changed in Laura's text was commented on in the sharing activity: the difference between the male possessive adjective and the female one (*his* and *her*). This aspect was introduced by a student, when the teacher asked what features they had identified in their texts that needed improvement. It was clear by the students' answers that most of them found it difficult to distinguish between the female and male possessives. After talking about it, it was clearer, at least for Laura, who changed it in her final love story. The excerpt about this topic can be read below.

Excerpt 3. Talking about the possessive adjectives (0'42'' – 0'56'')

45 T1 yes ↑ Maria ↑ ((pointing at a student))
46 S4 her **y** his ↓
47 and
48 T1 very good (.) her is for ↑ (1.2) boys or
49 girls ↓ ((moving her fingers))
50 S5 [girls
51 S6 [boys
52 Ss [boys
53 T1 HER ↑ ((opens her hands waiting for the
54 answer))
55 S6 [ah no girls
56 S2 [**mixto ya ves**
57 *mixed no problem*
58 Ss [xxx ((some noise from students commenting
59 on this and laughing))
60 T1 [her is for girls and [his is for ↑
61 T2 [shhh
62 Ss boys ↓
63 T1 for boys ↓ [very good ↓

In conclusion, all the analysed students changed something that could be identified to have been discussed in the sharing activity with the teacher. In Valeria's story, both changes were made concerning the structure (the title was changed and a paragraph was added to have three in the story), while in Laura's text, the title was changed as well, and grammar mistakes were corrected, about the possessive adjective. Finally, regarding the students in the other pair, both Halima and Juan changed a structural aspect, they added a title in their final texts.

4.3 Peer revision

The peer revision activity is part of the teaching sequence in a model texts as feedback task, as it was explained in the methodology. It consists of a conversation between students, who are usually divided into pairs, in which the learners revise their own and their classmates' texts with the help of a model or models (as it was the case in this study).

Its objective is for students to notice gaps in their knowledge, determine things they have written wrongly in their texts or interesting and suitable elements from the model that could be used in their own texts. In this section, an analysis of the peer revision conversation between the participants in the study (pair 1 and pair 2) is going to be conducted to see if the differences between the initial texts and final stories established before were discussed during these talks.

4.3.1 Pair 1

The peer revision conversation between the students in pair one, which lasted 3 minutes and a half, included only the revision of one of the texts, Laura's text (see the complete conversation in Appendix 8). The reason for this is the learners' different English levels. Laura and Valeria were able to jointly look at Laura's text and identify things which needed to be edited. However, when Laura read Valeria's text, she thought everything was correct and did not have any ideas in order to improve it or change any features, so Valeria looked at her text and edited it by herself, with no help from her peer. This part was not recorded, so only Laura's text will be contrasted here with their conversation, to check whether the differences between her initial and final texts, which were identified above, could be traced to have been discussed during this part of the teaching sequence.

In their conversation about Laura's love story, they talked about all the changed elements identified above regarding grammar and vocabulary but not about the ones that are related to the structure of the story or the punctuation. In the peer revision phase, the possessive adjective was a discussed element, as it was also present in the sharing activity with the teacher. Actually, both Laura and Valeria changed some of these determiners throughout the text (from *his* to *her*) and at a certain point during the talk, Laura asked her peer why *her* had to be written, to understand the grammar rule, as it can be observed in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 4. Talking about the possessive adjectives (01'14'' – 01'-49'')

41 L and his friend she told to tell his = her
42 ((pointing at the word)) parents
43 L **ponlo**((points at the text, Valeria writes))
44 *write it*
45 her ((pointing at another word from the
46 previous sentence)) her friend (.)her friend
47 her ((pointing at the word to show Valeria
48 and she writes))
49 V ((starts reading again)) her friend what
50 happened and her = **otro** her
51 *another*
52 V ((continues reading in a low voice pointing
53 at the words with the pen)) xxx
54 L her ↑ parents ↓
55 V ((nods and writes on the text))
56 L **por qué es** her ↑
57 *why is it*
58 V **porque es de ella** (.) **cuando es de ella** xxx
59 *because it is about her when it is about her*
60 L ((nods and continues reading))
61 because her parents ↑ ah **vale** ↓ (2.6)
62 *ok*

The rest of the grammar and vocabulary features which were altered in her final text have also been identified to be present during the peer conversation. In these cases, however, there was no explanation during the talk about the reason for the changes, Valeria said there was a mistake and wrote what she thought was correct on top of Laura's composition, but no further comments were made by any of the two students. During the conversation, one student or the other read the text and stopped when something wrong or improvable was detected. Most of the times Valeria was the one who found a language aspect that needed to be changed, but no explanation for the change was mentioned, being the possessive adjective the only exception. One example of this phenomenon could be observed in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 5. Making changes in the text (0'02'' – 0'17'')

8 V while (.) there is a mistake ↑ ((laughing))
9 [while she was ((writes on the text)) (10.6))
10 L [**vale** ↓ **corrígelo** ↓ ((pointing at the paper))
11 ok correct it

Finally, there was another feature at the end of the conversation that needs to be mentioned. The sentence which was added in Laura's text: *once they fell in love...*, was discussed during the students' interaction. The learners looked at the model for the first time and Laura identified a sentence in the first model (*Love, Simon*) which she found interesting to be included in her own text. First of all, she asked Valeria about its meaning to confirm it would fit in her text and then, she wrote it under the initial story, including an end to the sentence which was different from the one in the model. This discussion could be observed in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 6. Adding a sentence from the model text (2'30'' – 3'21'')

80 L **qué significa** (.)
81 what is the meaning of
82 ((reads from the model text)) once they fell
83 in love ↑
84 V ((looks at the model too))
85 L <**los dos se enamoraron** ↑>
86 they fell in love
87 ((makes a gesture with her fingers
88 indicating proximity))
89 V **sí** (.) **creo** ↓
90 yes I think so
91 L **vale pues** ↑
92 ok so
93 ((pointing at a sentence in the model)) I
94 want to put this sentence ↑ ((looks at the
95 camera, smiles and starts writing underneath
96 her text))
97 L ((reading while writing)) <once (.) they
98 (.) fell (.) in (.) love ↓>
99 L ((looking at the model again))

100 mmm **cuando** (.) **cuando se** (.) **cómo se decía**
101 *when* *when they* *how do you say*
102 **cuando se = cuando se vieron** ↑
103 *when they* *when they met*
104 ((looking at Valeria))
105 V ((making a face meaning I don't know))
106 L when
107 V they met
108 L ((writes on the paper)) when ↑ (.) no ↓
109 ((crossing out what she has just written))
110 **cuando = la primera vez que se vieron**
111 *when* *the first time they met*
112 V **pues**
113 *so*
114 L the (.) first time ↑ ((looking for approval))
115 V ((nods))
116 L ((saying aloud what she's writing)) first
117 time ↑ ((looking at Valeria))
118 V they ↑
119 L they ↑ ((while writing))
120 V met ↑
121 L xxx they met ↓

Hence, after the analysis of this peer conversation, it could be said that most of the changes in Laura's text could be traced back to the peer conversation, particularly the differences related to grammar and lexicon. Moreover, regarding the procedure that was followed during the talk, the revision consisted of both girls reading Laura's text and stopping every time they saw something that needed improvement, which was most of the times identified by Valeria. The model was only looked at once throughout the talk. Finally, about the other text, nothing was discussed during the conversation since Valeria edited the text on her own, without any help from her peer.

4.3.2 Pair 2

With regards to the participants in pair number two, the peer revision conversation lasted four minutes and thirty-one seconds. It included the revision of both texts and followed the same procedure as in the first case (complete conversation to be found in Appendix 9).

First of all, Halima took Juan's text, read it aloud and corrected or marked the things that needed improvement according to her, commenting on some aspects with her peer and then, the same course of action was used in order to revise Halima's text. Juan read it and marked the things he identified to be improvable. In this part, as it was previously done, the conversation between the students was transcribed and will be analysed to check if the differences between their initial and final texts could be found to have been discussed during this part of the task.

Regarding the changed elements in Juan's text, which was the first one to be revised in their conversation, Juan's differences in punctuation and lexicon can be traced back to its origin: the peer revision task. In terms of lexicon, he wrote *with* rather than *without* in his final text and this was mentioned during the interaction. Moreover, throughout the conversation Halima changed some punctuation elements and these are present in Juan's final text. An example of a punctuation change can be seen below.

Excerpt 7. Changing punctuation (0'06'' – 0'15'')

10	H	mmm aquí creo que (.) has puesto un punto
11		<i>here I think have you written a full stop</i>
12		[o una coma ↑ ((pointing at the text))
13		<i>or a comma</i>
14	J	[una coma ↓
15		<i>a comma</i>
16	H	coma ↑ mmm sería punto ↓
17		<i>comma it should be full stop</i>
18		<i>((writes something on the paper))</i>

On the other hand, two of the differences between Halima's initial and final texts were commented on during the interaction. She added a subject before a verb in the second story (*he did not he dare*), which had been written by Juan while revising her text. Furthermore, she herself realised that a comma was needed and asked Juan to add it. The moment when Halima asked Juan to add it can be observed in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 8. Commenting on punctuation (4'11'' – 4'16'')

170 H **aquí (.) aquí pondría una coma** ↓
171 *here here I would write a comma*
172 ((pointing at the text with a pen))
173 J ((writes the comma where Halima tells him))

After having analysed this peer conversation, the data shows that this pair mostly identified features that according to them needed to be changed regarding the punctuation, apart from two other elements about grammar and lexicon. In this case, the procedure they used during the interaction was the same as the one used by pair number 1, since they did not discuss why the elements needed to be changed. They took the responsibility to correct each other's story and did the changes they thought needed to be done. In this case, the model was not helpful for the students in the revision process, they did not use anything from it.

5. Discussion

In this section, the data analysed above will be contrasted and discussed in the light of the reviewed literature. As a reminder, the aim of the research is to determine the differences between the initial texts and final stories of the students to then trace these changes to their origins and see whether they were originated during the interactional phase.

After describing the findings, it could be argued that all the students noticed gaps in their knowledge in their initial text, which were explicitly identified and edited. In addition, these edited or highlighted elements from the first texts then appeared in their final love stories. Hence, this study could support other findings present in different studies about the use of model texts as feedback, such as García Mayo & Labandibar (2017) or Roca de Larios & Martínez (2010), which also stated that students noticed things in their first texts which were incorporated in the rewriting stage.

This data suggests that output, students' productions, can play a role in noticing language aspects and pupils can learn from what they have written using the model texts as a feedback technique, which is congruous with the noticing theory developed by Schmidt (1990). A learner needs to notice a language feature in order to learn it. Moreover, as it is argued in García Mayo & Labandibar (2017), this noticing needs to be understood by students for them to remember that language aspect and truly learn it. In this case, however, with the available data, it is not possible to claim that all the language features which were noticed and changed were understood.

When tracing the changes, some features in each of the participants' text were present in the sharing activity. Hence, the data yielded by this study provides convincing evidence that this guided discovery during the sharing activity has an impact on the students' final productions, which is consistent with what Coyle & Cánovas (2019) concluded in their study. By raising the students' awareness of different categories, it is believed that students can improve their writing skills.

In this case, the improvements in the stories which could be directly linked to the sharing activity were grammatical and structural, as the conversation revolved around these aspects. In addition, one of the changes was observed in all the texts, they all added or improved their titles, and this had been discussed in the sharing activity. What this study shows is that with a general conversation between the teacher and the students, since the teacher did not give any specific examples, students were able to make connections between what was being said generally and their own texts. They noticed some features which needed improvement and made the necessary changes.

With regards to the models, the teacher guided and encouraged students to look at them. The objective was for them to find language features which were essential to be present in a love story, such as the title or the structure of a narrative text.

Scaffolding (Wood, Bruner & Ross, 1976) was used to help learners realise different aspects of the model. One clear example of this was when the teacher asked students the amount of parts a love story needed. At first, students did not know what to answer, so the question was asked again. This time, students answered while paying attention to the model, as it could be observed in the following excerpt.

Excerpt 9. Discussing the parts of a love story (2'14'' – 2'30'')

122 T1 and (.) have you seen ((pointing at her eyes
 123 with two fingers to show the verb see)) the
 124 <structure of the model> as well ↑
 125 ((dividing an imaginary story into three
 126 parts with her hand)) do you see that (.)
 127 <there are (.) different parts ↑> (2.3)
 128 ((dividing a text in the air again))
 129 T1 yes ↑ (1.4) in the model there are different
 130 parts ↑ or not ↓
 131 S14 yes ↓
 132 T1 yes ↑ how many parts ↑
 133 S14 one (.) two (.) three ↓

Afterwards, the teacher made them check their texts to see whether they had divided the story in different parts or not. This process had the purpose of raising students' language awareness on the structure and it had a positive impact on one of the participants' text, Valeria, who added a paragraph in her story. Hence, the model texts were useful in this part of the teaching sequence. It could be argued that a good teacher guidance in the sharing activity could lead to a better noticing by students.

Another final aspect that should be mentioned about this part of the teaching sequence is that the activity was engaging due to the high degree of self-selection on behalf of the students. This can be observed through the number of participants in the conversation, eighteen out of twenty-two students intervened (see Appendix 7). This could mean that students were actively listening and consequently, the activity was useful for them to reflect on what they had written and find gaps in their knowledge.

In addition, it should be mentioned that the Classroom Interactional Competence was present throughout the activity and its main characteristics were followed: the interaction between the teacher and the students was linked to the teaching goals (make learners realise things from their texts which could be improved), a “space for learning” was created and students felt comfortable and were able to speak freely (Escobar Urmeneta & Walsh, 2017).

With regards to the peer revision, the four participants in the study included elements in their final texts which had been discussed or identified during this activity, as it could be concluded after the thorough analysis of the conversations. From the data gathered, there are several aspects that need to be discussed and interpreted.

First of all, it could be argued that peer revision could have a positive impact on the students’ writing skills, as they realised features that needed to be improved or other elements that could be included in the text during this activity. These findings lend support to the claim that collaboration and interaction could have positive effects on the noticing process (Roca de Larios & Martínez (2010). An example of this phenomenon could be found in the conversation between the participants in pair 1. At a certain point, Laura asked Valeria why a grammar feature had to be corrected (*por qué her?*) and Valeria explained it to her (*porque es de ella*). Without the collaboration, Laura would not have learnt this aspect by herself and this way, she understood why it needed to be changed.

However, this meaningful interaction only occurred once during the peer revision activity and it was not present in pair 2’s conversation. This type of realisation was named “higher quality noticing” by García Mayo & Labandibar (2017) and would be desirable to be present throughout the noticing process, because the language feature needs to be not only seen by the student but also understood. In this case, Laura comprehended why the possessive adjective needed to be changed.

During the rest of the conversations, students read each other's texts and edited what they thought was to be changed without discussing the reasons for the change. This phenomenon could be the consequence of the lack of practice the students had about this type of activity. According to García Mayo & Labandibar (2017), the "higher quality noticing" has to be promoted and rehearsed for students to be able to learn from the gaps they find. For the students in the research, it was their second contact with this kind of corrective feedback, which could be the reason for the little presence of this type of interaction. Hence, this conversation should be rehearsed more for students to take more advantage of it. That day, more instructions by the teacher could have been given to make it clearer for students. The only command that was given to them was to discuss in pairs things they found could be improved from each other's love stories.

Another key aspect about the peer revision task, which is connected to the previous paragraph, is that the model texts were hardly looked at during this phase. On two occasions, the students mentioned something about the model. As for pair 1, Laura took a sentence from the model which was thought to be suitable for her love story. In the case of pair 2, Halima searched for something in the model, but she did not find it and stopped the exploration. Hence, it could be argued that the two model texts were not useful for them.

One possible interpretation for this which is thought to be plausible is that although the topic of the model was the same (love), the stories were very different from the ones they had written. So it might have been difficult for them to connect what they had written to the models. The lack of familiarity with this type of corrective feedback might have played a role in it, too. The available evidence from the sharing activity seems to suggest that scaffolding is needed for students to observe features in the model texts and then connect them to their own. Hence, it could have been difficult for them to find elements in the models when working autonomously.

Moreover, according to García Mayo & Labandibar (2017), it is essential to adapt the level of the model to the students' proficiency level so that they can understand it and find elements that could be useful for them. In this case, two models of different levels were designed for students to have different guides and options. However, it was not enough. Consequently, it would be advisable, especially when students are being introduced to this kind of corrective feedback to narrow the topic of the compositions. This way, students would write similar stories to the ones in the model and it would be more likely for them to find interesting and useful elements. Finally, more practice would also be advised to make models more meaningful.

The level of the students should also be mentioned in this discussion, as it should be considered when creating the pairs for the peer revision. In this case study, the pairs were created respecting the class distribution and the level was not taken into consideration for the grouping. The first pair in the study was unbalanced in terms of English proficiency level because Valeria had a higher level. This had both positive and negative consequences. On the one hand, Valeria was able to give a higher quality feedback to Laura and taught her some things. However, when Laura had to help Valeria edit her text, she did not find any improvements to be made because the level of the text was believed to be higher than hers. As for the second pair, the level was more balanced, but in this case, less feedback was provided for both participants and some wrong features were asked to be changed, such as adding a subject between *did not* and *dare* (*he did not he dare*).

It could be argued that lower proficiency level learners need more guidance during the noticing process, interpretation which is consistent with the findings in García Mayo & Labandibar (2017). In addition, the level of the students needs to be considered by the teacher when creating pairs and it should be done depending on the objectives of the task.

6. Conclusion

After having interpreted and discussed the data, it is time to draw the conclusions. First of all, the research questions will be restated in order to formulate answers for each of them and see whether the objectives were reached.

- **RQ 1** What differences (in terms of structure, punctuation, grammar and lexicon) can be observed between the students' initial and final texts?

- **RQ 1.1** What influence might class conversations have had in the differences observed?

In terms of the RQ 1, an analysis of the students' initial and final texts was conducted in order to identify the differences between them. The data shows that all the participants made changes to their initial texts which were present in the final stories. Furthermore, these changes were of different nature, concerning structure, punctuation, grammar and lexicon, one of them being present in all the texts, the title. In two cases, the title was changed to connect it more to the story and in the other two, it was added in their final stories, as it had not been written in the initial texts.

In order to answer RQ 1.1, the transcription of the three conversations (during the sharing activity and the peer revision tasks) was taken into account to trace the origin of the differences found when answering RQ 1. After the analysis of the data, most differences were observed to be present during the sharing activity or the peer revision task, except for Valeria, whose text was not revised during the peer revision activity. It has to be highlighted that most of the changes of the other three students could be traced to have their origin in the peer revision conversation.

However, it needs to be said that not all the changes which were found in the final love stories have been traced to their origin, because they did not appear in the class conversations or in the model texts.

Hence, it could be argued that self-awareness was also key to improve the students' texts, especially in Valeria's case, who edited her text alone, because her peer could not help her.

Moreover, other findings which refer to the design of the activity, the sharing activity and the peer revision task in particular, were also found and discussed. It is believed that they should be considered to ensure the success of this kind of activity in class. First of all, regarding the sharing activity, the teacher is advised to create a space for learning for students to feel comfortable and speak freely. Moreover, the language features which are mentioned by the teacher during the activity should be carefully chosen to make sure that students learn from the conversation and to align the interaction with the teaching goal. This way, the Classroom Interactional Competence would be adopted in class and interaction could be used as a means for students to learn, following the sociocultural perspective.

In addition to this, the teacher needs to bear in mind that their guidance in this part of the sequence can lead to the improvement of the students' writing skills. Scaffolding is essential to raise students' awareness of different aspects of the models and their own texts. This guidance could also be useful for students to learn how to use the model texts when they work autonomously in the other activity, the peer revision task.

With regards to the second activity that was studied in this research, the peer revision task, several aspects should be considered when implementing it in class. First of all, in order to achieve a "higher quality noticing", it is essential for students to rehearse their abilities in noticing and revising. In other words, practice should be encouraged for them to achieve a higher degree of noticing which would have a positive impact on the development of their writing skills. This would happen because with a higher degree of noticing, students could understand the noticed language feature and consequently, remember it.

Another important thing to consider is the level of the students when pairing them, as lower proficiency pupils need more guidance. Finally, the level of the models has also to be taken into account, since they should match the level of the students for them to find interesting and helpful features that could be used to improve their texts.

Regarding the two main objectives of the research, it could be claimed that both have been accomplished. On the one hand, the role of interaction in the development of students' writing skills has been explored. Students do find gaps in their knowledge during the interactional phase and they include them in their final texts. Hence, it could be argued that feedback could improve students' writing skills. However, it has to be taken into consideration that this study has limitations. Only one exercise was conducted with these students so it would be presumptuous to conclude that students will remember the things they noticed. From the available data, it is not possible to determine whether this learning will stay with the students in their long-term memory or not.

On the other hand, the other aim, which was the development and improvement of one's teaching practice by reflecting on activity planning and classroom performance has also been fulfilled. This teaching technique is believed to have a positive impact on the development of students' writing skills, since students notice gaps in their knowledge and take a more active role in the edition and improvement of their texts. It would be an interesting activity to be developed in class in the future.

Also, a reflection on how the activity was developed has been conducted and the possible improvements and things to consider when implementing it have been previously stated. It is believed that this analysis should be considered when using this teaching sequence in class. Finally, knowing how to conduct research could be a useful tool to be used in the future, to analyse one's teaching practice and learn from it as a means to become a better teacher.

Regarding the study, it would be advisable to conduct further research on the topic to gain a better understanding of this type of feedback on the development of students' writing skills and continue helping teachers to implement this activity. In order to see the extent to which the writing skills are improved with this type of feedback, a study in which the teaching sequence would be conducted more than once with the same group of students would be interesting. This way it would be possible to observe whether what is noticed and the changes students make in their final texts contribute to a better writing performance in future activities.

Finally, there is only one thing left to say. As a teacher-as-researcher, this project has been a challenge as well as an interesting learning opportunity. Writing is an important skill to be learnt in second language acquisition, but one had always wondered whether the traditional output feedback given to students was effective for them to learn. For some pupils, it is useful to receive their compositions back with comments and corrections written by the teacher. However, others do not pay attention to them or do not understand what the teacher means, so this type of feedback does not contribute to learning. The noticing theory, and the use of model texts as feedback in particular, could be a better way to ensure the development of the students' writing skills.

Thanks to this project, the discovery of this approach has occurred as well as a deep understanding of how it should be implemented in class. And this will be very useful for the future teaching practice as a means to help students develop their writing skills in English.

7. References

Coyle, Y. & Cánovas Guirao, J. (2019). Learning to Write in a Second Language: The Role of Guided Interaction in Promoting Children's Noticing from Model Texts. *CLIL Journal of Innovation and Research in Plurilingual and Pluricultural Education*, 2(1), 21-30. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/clil.22>

Escobar Urmeneta, C., Gilabert, R. & Sarramona, J. (Coord.). (2015). Competències bàsiques de l'àmbit lingüístic (llengües estrangeres). Educació secundària. Generalitat de Catalunya. Departament d'Ensenyament. <http://ensenyament.gencat.cat/web/.content/home/departament/publicacions/colleccions/competencies-basiques/eso/eso-linguistic-estrangeres.pdf>

Escobar Urmeneta, C. & Walsh, S. (2017). Classroom interactional competence in content and language integrated learning. In: Llinares, A. and Morton, T. *Applied Linguistics Perspectives on CLIL*. Amsterdam (Holland): John Benjamins, pp. 189-206.

García Mayo, M.P. & Labandibar, U. L. (2017). The Use of Models as Written Corrective Feedback in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Writing. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 37, 110-127. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0267190517000071>.

Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcription symbols with an introduction. In: Lerner, G. (ed.). *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*. Amsterdam (Holland): John Benjamins, pp. 13-31.

Martínez-Ciprés, H. (2016). La interacción como herramienta para mejorar la producción escrita: un estudio de caso. *E-Aesla*, 2, 85-94.

Martínez Esteban, N. & Roca de Larios, J. (2010). The Use of Models as a Form of Written Feedback to Secondary School Pupils of English. *International Journal of English Studies*, 10(2), 143-170. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6018/ijes/2010/2/119241>.

Moore, E. (2016). Aprendizaje de lenguas e interacción social. En: Masats, D. & Nussbaum L. (eds.). *Enseñanza y aprendizaje de las lenguas extranjeras en educación secundaria obligatoria*. Madrid (España): Síntesis, pp. 35-58.

Nussbaum, L. (2017). Doing research with teachers. In: Moore, E. & Dooley, M. (eds). *Qualitative approaches to research on plurilingual education*. Research-publishing.net, pp. 46-67. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14705/rpnet.2017.emmd2016.621>

Schmidt, R. W. (1990). The Role of Consciousness in Second Language Learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/11.2.129>

Williams, J. (2012). The potential role(s) of writing in second language development. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(4), 321–331. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.09.007>

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S. & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17(2), 89–100. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x>

8. Appendixes

Appendix.1 Model texts

Love, Simon

Simon knew he was gay, but he didn't know how to come out to his parents and friends. He liked boys, but he was scared of people's reactions, so he decided to register in an online chat where he could meet new people to speak about his fears and share his feelings.

Some days later, he noticed a boy on the net and they started chatting. Simon was very excited because he had finally found someone who understood him and he didn't have to play pretend. After a few weeks, the only thing Simon thought about was being able to log into the chat and see Kevin online. Since then, they talked for hours every day. Simon had never opened up to anyone like he had with Kevin; he totally had a crush on him!

Suddenly, Simon recognised that he was in love with Kevin. He wanted to date him in real life and they agreed to meet. Finally, they met up at a park and immediately realised how much they liked each other. Once they fell in love, they knew they would tell those who loved them when they were ready.

Unrequited love

When I first saw Christine on TV I immediately became interested in her. She was an English athlete, and I wanted to meet her, so I looked for her email address until I found it. Then, I contacted her and we met. It was love at first sight, and after only one year, we got married.

But life was not easy. Christine had to train a lot because she wanted to participate in the Olympic Games. I always supported her but she didn't pay attention to what happened in my life. She was only focused on getting a place in the competition, and everything else turned secondary. She didn't care for me or my feelings.

One day, we had arranged to have dinner at a restaurant to celebrate our anniversary. I waited for her until I realised that Christine had forgotten about it. In that moment, I decided to break up with her. I wanted a partner who loved me and had time for me, not one that only thought about herself.

Appendix 2. Texts from the students (Valeria)

Initial text (T1)

A LOVE STORY

①

Jorja Smith ~~x~~ a student from England ~~x~~ decided to go to S. Korea to study, she was 19 years old. When she arrived to Seoul she went to her campus. Everyone was looking at her, Jorja's skin was a little dark, ~~*~~ brown eyes, and black hair. She was a little bit nervous, but she saw a boy who was staring at her all the time, she didn't know what to do. They fell in love at first sight, his name was Haseok and he was Korean. The time ~~*~~ passed and they completely fell in love, but there was one problem, the parents of Haseok ~~x~~ didn't approve their relationship. They wanted that his son to marry a rich ~~*~~ Asian girl and not a foreign girl. Haseok decided to go to America to live with her girlfriend Jorja, because he loved her and he didn't want to leave her.

They travelled to America and they got married and they had kids.

The morale of this story is that love has no barriers.

~~*~~, ~~*~~,

~~*~~ she had ~~to~~

~~*~~ went on

~~x~~ Haseok's parents

~~*~~ Asian

Final love story (T2)

LOVE HAS NO BARRIERS

2

Jorja Smith, a student from England, decided to go to South Korea to study. She was 19 years old. When she arrived to Seoul she went to her campus. Everyone was looking at her, Jorja's skin was a little dark, she had brown eyes and dark hair. She was a little bit nervous, but she saw a boy who was staring at her all the time, she didn't know what to do.

They fell in love at first sight, his name was Hoseok and he was Korean. The time went on and they completely fell in love, but there was one problem, Hoseok's parents didn't approve their relationship. They wanted that his son to marry a rich Asian girl and not a foreign girl.

Hoseok decided to go to America to live with her girlfriend Jorja, he loved her and he didn't want to leave her.

They travelled to America and they got married and they had kids.

The moral of this story is that love has no barriers.

Appendix 3. Texts from the students (Laura)

Initial text (T1)

①

A LOVE STORY

A summer day Betty she went for a walk. ~~While~~ ^{was walking and} she walked she found a girl and she was surprised because it called ^{her} ~~his~~ attention. She likes boys but girls too, and she was scared because she had never ~~said~~ ^{told} ~~she~~ ^{to anybody} that she likes girls. Days after, she told ^{her} ~~his~~ friend what happened and ^{of} ~~her~~ friend she told to tell ^{her} ~~his~~ parents, because ^{her} ~~his~~ parents they would understand, also to the girls who she like. Betty ~~she~~ was very frightened but ^{finally} ~~she~~ ~~she~~ she told to ^{her} ~~his~~ parents and they understood her. In the end Betty and the girl they ^{started} ~~were~~ girlfriends. ^{dating}

Once they fell in love, ~~was~~ the first time they met.

Final love story (T2)

②

FALLING IN LOVE

A summer day Betty she went for a walk. She was walking and she found a girl, and she was surprised because it called her attention. Once they fell in love, the first time they met. She likes boys but girls too, and she was scared because she had never told to anybody that she likes girls. Days after she told her friend what happened, and her friend she told to tell her parents, because her parents they would understand, also to girl who she like. Betty was very frightened, but finally she told to her parents and they understood her. In the end Betty and the girl started

Appendix 4. Texts from the students (Halima)

Initial text (T1)

Once upon a time a girl who was walking with her friends in the park. And they found a group of very handsome guys and she liked a guy who was there, then the guys came over and started talking. The girl called Lina, wanted to ask the number of the guy she liked.

But he did not ^{he} dare. The boy that he likes was called Omar.

The Omar approached the line and told him:

- hello, what's your name
- My name is Lina and you
- My name is Omar
- would you like to go eat with me one day? said Omar
- yes, I like you
- As ??? I just wanted to ask you to leave as friends. I'm sorry but I'm not attracted to girls.
- Ohh!! it's worth the breath.

to be continue !!!

Final love story (T2)

LOOKS are deceiving ...

2

once upon a time a girl who was walking with her friends in the park. And they found a group of very handsome guys and she liked a guy who was there, then the guys came over and started talking. the girl called Lina, wanted to ask the number of the guy she liked.

But he did not dare. the boy that he likes was called Omar.

The Omar approached the line and told him.

- Hello, what's your name?
- My name is Lina, and you?
- My name is Omar.
- Would you like to go eat with me one day?
- said Omar.
- yes, I like you
- How?? I just wanted to ask you to leave as friends. I'm sorry but I'm not attracted to girls.
- Ohh!!! is worth the breath.

TO BE CONTINUE!!!

Appendix 5. Texts from the students (Juan)

Initial text (T1)

Once upon a time a Summer, The last day of class. In a class, there was a little talkative and unsociable boy. In his same class there was a girl, who like the girl and explained all his feelings and she was left without reacting and finally said something. She said that she also liked him but, could not go out with me with anyone because he was going to live in another country.

Final love story (T2)

LAST MOMENT

Once upon a time a Summer. The last day of class. In a class, there was a little talkative and unsociable boy. In his same class there was a girl, who like to the girl and explained all his feelings and she was left with reacting and finally said something. She said that she also liked him but, could not go out with anyone because he was going to live in another country:

Appendix 6. Symbols of transcription

Adapted from the Jeffersonian Transcript Notation System

T1	Teacher-as-researcher
T2	Regular teacher
Ss	Students
S1... S18	Students
L	Laura (student in pair 1)
V	Valeria (student in pair 1)
H	Halima (student in pair 2)
J	Juan (student in pair 2)
(.)	A brief pause
(# of seconds)	Timed pause in speech
↑	Rising pitch or intonation
↓	Falling pitch or intonation
:	Prolongation of sound
< >	Enclosed speech was delivered more slowly than usual for the speaker
> <	Enclosed speech was delivered more rapidly than usual for the speaker
Underline	The speaker is emphasizing or stressing the speech
◦ ◦	Whisper, reduced volume or quiet speech
ALL CAPS	Shouted or increased volume speech
[Starting point of overlapping speech
=	Indicates latching
xxx	Speech which is unclear or in doubt in the transcription
(())	Annotation of non-verbal activity
BOLD	Speech in Spanish
<i>italics</i>	Translation in English

Appendix 7. Transcription of the sharing activity

1 T1 [hello: ((waving))
2 Ss [xxx ((some chatting among students))
3 S1 [QUITA
4 move away
5 T2 [shhh
6 S1 [I'm so sorry
7 T2 [shhh
8 T [have you (.) have you finished ↓ (.) more
9 or less ↑ ((moving her hands))
10 Ss [ye::s ↓
11 T1 [yes ↑ ok ↑
12 T1 so (.) what have you seen in your texts
13 ((pointing at both her eyes to exemplify the
14 verb see)) (.) that you want to improve ↓
15 ((moving her hands))
16 Ss xxx ((some students speaking in a low voice))
17 T2 shhh
18 T1 things that you have seen ↓ tell me ↓
19 Ss [xxx
20 T1 for example about the ve::rbs ↑ have you
21 seen that there were mistakes with the
22 ve:rbs ↑
23 Ss YE:S ↓
24 T1 yes ↑ ((pointing at a student))
25 T1 what happens with the verbs ↑
26 S2 they were in present ↓
27 T1 ah ok ↓ some verbs were in present so you
28 have changed them (1.4) into the [past ↑
29 ((moving her hands backwards))
30 S3 [past ↓
31 T1 ok ↓
32 T1 so look at your texts ((making the
33 same gesture to exemplify look and
34 gesticulating)) yes ↑ to see if there's any

35 verbs that are still in the present ↓ yes ↑
 36 more things that you have seen ↓
 37 S2 them mmm
 38 T1 [them ↓ very good ↑ ((gesticulating))
 39 S2 [and they
 40 T1 they ↓ yes ↓
 41 T1 so when it is at the beginning is they ↑ and
 42 when it's after is ↑
 43 S2 them ↓
 44 T1 them ↓ very good ↑ ((nodding)) yes ↑
 45 T1 yes ↑ Maria ↑ ((pointing at a student))
 46 S4 her **y** his ↓
 47 and
 48 T1 very good (.) her is for ↑ (1.2) boys or
 49 girls ↓ ((moving her fingers))
 50 S5 [girls
 51 S6 [boys
 52 Ss [boys
 53 T1 HER ↑ ((opens her hands waiting for the
 54 answer))
 55 S6 [ah no girls
 56 S2 [**mixto ya ves**
 57 *mixed no problem*
 58 Ss [xxx ((some noise from students commenting
 59 on this and laughing))
 60 T1 [her is for girls and [his is for ↑
 61 T2 [shhh
 62 Ss boys ↓
 63 T1 for boys ↓ [very good ↓
 64 S2 [**hala otro** mistake
 65 *wow another*
 66 T2 shhhh
 67 Ss xxx
 68 T1 ok ↓ more things you have seen ↑
 69 ((exemplifying see with her fingers))

70 T1 <any vocabulary that you li:ke ↑ from the
 71 model ↑> ((making a gesture meaning a text))
 72 S7 no ↓
 73 S2 [soulmate ↓
 74 T1 [no ↑ soulmate (.) ok ↑ ((pointing at the
 75 student who said that)) very good ↑
 76 S8 soulxxx
 77 T1 soul ↑ ((approaching the student who said
 78 the previous word to hear better))
 79 S8 no no (.) [nothing
 80 T1 [ah ok ↓
 81 T1 [anything you have seen (.) that you like
 82 (.)from the model ((drawing lines with her
 83 hands to exemplify the text)) for example I
 84 don't know (.) for example ((points at the
 85 word written on the blackboard)) connectors↑
 86 Ss [xxx ((some students talking))
 87 S9 [yes ↓
 88 T1 [have you seen = yes ↑ ((points at a
 89 student)) for example ↑
 90 S9 mmm ↑ but ↓
 91 T1 but (.) ok (.) very good (.) yes ↑
 92 T1 anything else ↑ = any other connectors
 93 ((pointing at the word written on the
 94 blackboard again)) that you like ↑ (.) from
 95 the text ↑ (2.5)
 96 T1 [no ↑ ok ↓
 97 T1 and (1.6) have you seen ((pointing at her
 98 left eye to exemplify see)) the title ↑ in
 99 the model (.) text ↑
 100 S10 ah no no **yo no he puesto** xxx
 101 *I have not written*
 102 T1 ok ↓ so do you think that a story needs a
 103 title ↑ or not ↓
 104 Ss yes ↓

105 T1 yes ↓ and the title is a love story ↑ or it
 106 can be a bit more (.) original ↓
 107 ((gesticulating))
 108 S12 original ↓
 109 T1 more original ↑ yes ↑ for example yours
 110 ((pointing at a student)) >was original<
 111 ((smiling)) yes ↑ ok ↑
 112 T1 so (.) maybe you can change the title >as
 113 well ↑< yes ↑ >instead of saying< a love
 114 story (.) you can say (.) I don't know (2.1)
 115 something related to the story ↑ yes ↑
 116 ((gesticulating throughout the explanation))
 117 S13 yes ↓
 118 T1 could you do that ↑ yes ↑
 119 S13 [I can
 120 T1 [Aitor ((laughing a little)) ok ↑ very
 121 good (.) yes ↑
 122 T1 and (.) have you seen ((pointing at her eyes
 123 with two fingers to show the verb see)) the
 124 <structure of the model> as well ↑
 125 ((dividing an imaginary story into three
 126 parts with her hand)) do you see that (.)
 127 <there are (.) different parts ↑> (2.3)
 128 ((dividing a text in the air again))
 129 T1 yes ↑ (1.4) in the model there are different
 130 parts ↑ or not ↓
 131 S14 yes ↓
 132 T1 yes ↑ how many parts ↑
 133 S14 one (.) two (.) three ↓
 134 T1 three (.) ok ↓ so in your stories (.) do you
 135 have (.) [different parts ↑ ((dividing an
 136 imaginary story into different parts with
 137 her hands)) or everything is together ↓
 138 ((showing just one block with both hands))
 139 S1 [one (.) two (.) three (.) °one two three

140 one two three° ((singing))
 141 S15 together ↓
 142 T1 [together ↑
 143 S16 [together ↓
 144 S14 [**dos** parts
 145 *two*
 146 T1 two parts ↑ ok ↓
 147 T1 do you think you have to divide the story
 148 into parts ↑ ((dividing an imaginary story
 149 into three parts)) or not ↓ (2.2) what do
 150 you think ↑
 151 S12 yes ↓
 152 T1 yes ↑ (.) ((pointing at a student)) maybe ↑
 153 why ↑
 154 S17 ((laughing)) °**ya te ha cogido**°
 155 *she has caught you*
 156 T1 <because ↑>
 157 S12 because (1.5) the first part are the
 158 ((stops to think)) (3.7)
 159 T1 introduction ↑
 160 S12 **sí** [introduction ↓
 161 yes
 162 T1 [yes ↑ ok ↑
 163 S12 and the second part is °the story xxx°
 164 T1 yes ↑ (.) ok ↑ very good ↓ we need an
 165 introduction ↑ no ↑ then we explain the story
 166 more or less ↑ (1.6) and then the conclusion ↓
 167 (.) the resolution ↓ (.) yes ↑ ((splitting
 168 an imaginary text in the air with her hands))
 169 so maybe you can divide your story (.) into
 170 paragraphs (.) into different parts (.) look
 171 at them ↓ (.) ok ↑ ((gesticulating))
 172 T1 anything else ↑ you want to (.) have you =
 173 you have seen ↑ in the text ↑ no ↑
 174 Ss no ↓

175 T1 they were very good eh ↑ so I'm very happy
 176 (.) and very original (.) so very good ↓
 177 (2.4) [so now ↓
 178 S18 [thanks ↓
 179 T1 I will ask you a last thing (.) I'm sorry
 180 [but yes ↑ ((joining both hands like if she
 181 was begging))
 182 S8 [thank you ↓
 183 T1 so you're going to write your story again(.)
 184 yes ↑
 185 Ss buff ((showing disapproval))
 186 T1 no no but the same story eh ↑ you don't have
 187 to invent anything (.) yes ↑ the story ↓
 188 S2 [correct it ↓
 189 T1 [but the final version yes ↑ so [this one is
 190 like a draft ↑ ((drawing inverted commas with
 191 her hands)) yes ↑ like >you had your ideas
 192 and everything< ((pretending to be writing
 193 with her right hand)) and now you're going
 194 to correct = you can use the same paper eh ↑
 195 if you want ↑(.) or a different paper ↓ ok ↑
 196 Ss [xxx
 197 T1 but (.) now (.) you can look at the title
 198 (.) maybe cha::nge it ↑ yes ↑ correct the
 199 mista::kes ↑ ok ↑ ((gesticulating throughout
 200 the explanation))

Appendix 8. Transcription of the peer revision (pair 1)

1 Ss ((Both students look at Laura's text and
2 Valeria has a pen on her right hand. Valeria
3 starts reading Laura's text pointing at the
4 writing with her pen. Noise throughout the
5 recording from the teacher and the other
6 students in the classroom, who are doing the
7 same exercise in pairs))
8 V while (.) there is a mistake ↑ ((laughing))
9 [while she was ((writes on the text)) (10.6))
10 L [**vale** ↓ **corrígelo** ↓ ((pointing at the paper))
11 *ok correct it*
12 Ss ((both students read the love story in a low
13 voice while Valeria points at the words with
14 a pen)) and she was surprised because it
15 called her
16 L it called her ↑ ((pointing at a word with
17 her pen)) called ↓
18 V ((writes something on the text)) (5.8)
19 L ((continues reading the text)) she likes
20 boys but girls too and she = **mira esto**
21 *look at this*
22 V ((reads quietly))
23 L **no esto** ↓ ((pointing at something))
24 *no this*
25 V ((nods and continues reading)) and
26 she was scared because (.) she ↑
27 L **no pero no vas a cambiarla** ↑ xxx
28 *no but aren't you going to change it*
29 V ((nodding)) told ↑ told ↑ ((writes something
30 on the text)) xxx ((turns the paper around
31 to write more comfortably and continues
32 writing)) (11.6)

33 L ((looking at the paper)) **qué dices** ↑
 34 *what are you saying*
 35 V ((reads part of what she has written)) likes
 36 girls ((both laugh a little))
 37 L ((continues reading her love story)) days
 38 after ↑ (.) she told her friends that [what
 39 happened <happened>
 40 V [((writes something))
 41 L and his friend she told to tell his = her
 42 ((pointing at the word)) parents
 43 L **ponlo** ((points at the text, Valeria writes))
 44 *write it*
 45 her ((pointing at another word from the
 46 previous sentence)) her friend (.)her friend
 47 her ((pointing at the word to show Valeria
 48 and she writes))
 49 V ((starts reading again)) her friend what
 50 happened and her = **otro** her
 51 *another*
 52 V ((continues reading in a low voice pointing
 53 at the words with the pen)) xxx
 54 L her ↑ parents ↓
 55 V ((nods and writes on the text))
 56 L **por qué es** her ↑
 57 *why is it*
 58 V **porqué es de ella** (.) **cuando es de ella** xxx
 59 *because it is about her when it is about her*
 60 L ((nods and continues reading))
 61 because her parents ↑ ah **vale** ↓ (2.6)
 62 *ok*
 63 ((continues reading)) they would understand
 64 also to the girl who she like ↓ ((looks at
 65 Valeria looking for approval))
 66 V **sí** (.) **está bien**
 67 *yes it is right*

68 L ((continues reading)) Betty she was very
69 <frightened>
70 V ((writes something and continues reading))
71 °very frightened but finally [she ↑°
72 L ((continues reading)) [she told his parents
73 ((stops and Valeria starts writing))
74 L (2.4) his = her parents (2.3) and they
75 understood [her
76 V ((continues reading)) [her in the end ↑ xxx
77 L **hala pues cámbialo**
78 wow so *change it*
79 V ((writes something on the text)) (6.3)
80 L **qué significa (.)**
81 *what is the meaning of*
82 ((reads from the model text)) once they fell
83 in love ↑
84 V ((looks at the model too))
85 L **<los dos se enamoraron ↑>**
86 *they fell in love*
87 ((makes a gesture with her fingers
88 indicating proximity))
89 V **sí (.) creo ↓**
90 *yes I think so*
91 L **vale pues ↑**
92 *ok so*
93 ((pointing at a sentence in the model)) I
94 want to put this sentence ↑ ((looks at the
95 camera, smiles and starts writing underneath
96 her text))
97 L ((reading while writing)) <once (.) they
98 (.) fell (.) in (.) love ↓>
99 L ((looking at the model again))
100 mmm **cuando (.) cuando se (.) cómo se decía**
101 *when when they how do you say*

102 **cuando se = cuando se vieron** ↑
 103 *when they when they met*
 104 ((looking at Valeria))
 105 V ((making a face meaning I don't know))
 106 L when
 107 V they met
 108 L ((writes on the paper)) when ↑ (.) no ↓
 109 ((crossing out what she has just written))
 110 **cuando = la primera vez que se vieron**
 111 *when the first time they met*
 112 V **pues**
 113 *so*
 114 L the (.) first time ↑ ((looking for approval))
 115 V ((nods))
 116 L ((saying aloud what she's writing)) first
 117 time ↑ ((looking at Valeria))
 118 V they ↑
 119 L they ↑ ((while writing))
 120 V met ↑
 121 L xxx they met ↓
 122 Ss ((they both look at the model again))
 123 L **ya está**
 124 *done*
 125 V **sí**
 126 *yes*

Appendix 9. Transcription of the peer revision (pair 2)

1 Ss ((Both students look at Juan's text and
2 Halima has a pen on her right hand. She
3 starts reading his text aloud pointing at
4 the writing with her pen. Noise throughout
5 the recording from the teacher and the other
6 students in the classroom who are doing the
7 same exercise in pairs))
8 H **en verano** ↑ the last day of class ↓
9 *In the summer*
10 H mmm **aquí creo que (.) has puesto un punto**
11 *here I think have you written a full stop*
12 **[o una coma** ↑ ((pointing at the text))
13 *or a comma*
14 J **[una coma** ↓
15 *a comma*
16 H **coma** ↑ mmm **sería punto** ↓
17 *comma it should be full stop*
18 ((writes something on the paper))
19 H xxx in a class there was a little (.)
20 talkative ((having difficulties to
21 pronounce it)) talkative **quieres decir** ↑
22 *do you mean*
23 mmm talking ↑ (.) **de hablar** ↑
24 *from talk*
25 J **esto está bien así** ↓
26 *this is ok like that*
27 H **vale** ↓
28 *ok*
29 H ((continues reading)) and unsociable (.)
30 **qué quieres decir con esto** ↑
31 *what do you mean by that*
32 J **Insociable** ↓
33 *unsociable*
34 H ((continues reading)) boy (3.1)

35 **esto qué signo es** ↑
36 *what sign is that*
37 ((pointing at something from the text))
38 J **una coma** ↓
39 *a comma*
40 H **pues pongo punto** ↓
41 *so I will write full stop*
42 ((writes something on the text and starts
43 reading again)) his same class there was a
44 girl ↑ (2.3) comma ↓ ((writes the comma on
45 the paper)) who like xxx ((looks at Juan))
46 J °**qué** ↑°
47 *what*
48 H **hay un punto aquí** ↑ ((pointing at the text))
49 *is there a full stop here*
50 J no ↓
51 H **aquí qué hay** ↑
52 *what's in here*
53 ((circling something on the paper))
54 J to ↓
55 H **esto no sería una coma no** ↑ = **no se pueden**
56 *this shouldn't be a comma you can't write*
57 **dos comas a la vez**
58 *two commas at the same time*
59 J °**vale** ↓°
60 *ok*
61 H to the girl and ex ((stops because she
62 doesn't understand Juan's writing))
63 **qué pone aquí** ↑
64 *what does it say here*
65 J explained ↓ ((reading from the text))
66 H °explained° (3.2) **y aquí** ↑
67 *and here*
68 ((pointing at a word in the text))
69 J all ↓

70 H all ↑ ((writes something on the paper)) (2.4)
 71 ((continues reading)) his feelings (.)
 72 feelings ↑ and she was left with ↓ (.)
 73 with ↑
 74 J °without ↓°
 75 H **sería** with ((crosses something out))
 76 *it should be*
 77 H ((starts reading again)) reacting and
 78 finally (.) ((starts looking for something
 79 in the model text)) **esto está aquí** (.)
 80 *that is here*
 81 **lo he visto por aquí** (4.6)
 82 *I have seen it around here*
 83 **mira diría que está por aquí**
 84 *look I would say it's around here*
 85 ((pointing at a part of the model text))
 86 ((starts reading Juan's text again) and she
 87 also (1.2) liked but could not ((they look
 88 at each other))
 89 H ((points at something from the text))
 90 **y aquí qué pone** ↑
 91 *and what does it say here*
 92 J go ↓
 93 H [go ↑
 94 J [go ↓
 95 H out with me ↑ ((looks at Juan))
 96 J with ↓
 97 H **aquí qué pone** ↑
 98 *what does it say here*
 99 ((points at something from the text)) me ↑
 100 J no ↓
 101 H with no ((keeps reading the text in a
 102 murmur pointing at the words)) xxx
 103 H **aquí** ↑ ((pointing at something in the text))
 104 *here*

105 J another ↓
 106 H **eso es una r** ↑
 107 *is it an r*
 108 J **sí** ↓
 109 *yes*
 110 H ((writes something on the text and finishes
 111 reading it)) country (.) **vale**
 112 *ok*
 113 J **ahora no lo tengo que corregir no** ↑
 114 *now I don't have to correct it do I*
 115 H no **ya está** xxx
 116 *that's it*
 117 H **ahora tienes que volver a corregirlo aquí** ↓
 118 *now you have to correct it here*
 119 ((pointing at the bottom of Juan's paper and
 120 then at her own composition))
 121 **ahora tienes que corregirme tu** ↓
 122 *now you have to correct mine*
 123 Ss xxx ((Juan takes the red pen))
 124 Ss xxx
 125 J **lo hago** ↑
 126 *do I do it*
 127 H **sí** ↓
 128 *yes*
 129 Ss xxx
 130 J ((starts reading Halima's text))(5.3)
 131 H **corrígeme corrígeme** ↓
 132 *correct me correct me*
 133 J xxx (1.7) **qué pone aquí** ↑
 134 *what does it say here*
 135 ((pointing at something from the text))
 136 H and ↓
 137 J xxx
 138 H **ya ya** ((smiling))
 139 *I know I know*

140 J ((writes something on the paper and
 141 continues reading quietly)) (13.2)
 142 H **esto es** xxx ↑
 143 *is this*
 144 ((pointing at something in the text))
 145 J ((continues reading quietly)) (13.6)
 146 **qué pone aquí** ↑
 147 *what does it say here*
 148 ((pointing with the pen))
 149 H **no sé** ((looking closer)) xxx dare ↓
 150 *I don't know*
 151 J dare ↑ **qué es** ↑
 152 *what is it*
 153 H **no sé (.) estaba en el traductor**
 154 *I don't know I found it on the translator*
 155 Ss ((laughing))
 156 J **lo voy a encerclar**
 157 *I'm going to circle it*
 158 H ((nodding))
 159 J ((keeps reading quietly)) oma ↑
 160 ((pointing at a word from the text))
 161 H Omar ↓
 162 J ((writes on the paper again while Halima is
 163 laughing)) (4.8)
 164 J approach ↑ ((reading all the letters and
 165 pointing at the word while making a confused
 166 face))
 167 H <approach> approached ↓ ((pointing at the
 168 word as well))
 169 J ((nodding))
 170 H **aquí (.) aquí pondría una coma** ↓
 171 *here I would write a comma here*
 172 ((pointing at the text with a pen))
 173 J ((writes the comma where Halima tells him))
 174 H xxx ((they finish reading the text))